Ham-Policy Digest   Tue, 20 Jul 93   Volume 93 : Issue 242

Today's Topics:
                        ARRL policymaking
                     Give a VE $5.60, walk
              Order pizza on your autopatch now (3 msgs)
               The Canonical list of Code-Wars Answers

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 20 Jul 1993 10:35:18 -0700
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
darwin.sura.net!mojo.eng.umd.edu!news.isi.com!news.isi.com!not-for-
mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL policymaking
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul20.053319.765@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com
(nuts2u::little) writes:

>So please, end the suspense, did the membership vote the board members out?
>If the board's action was so reprehensible and opposed to the general
>memberships views, how many were voted out?

Probably none. But then again, how many check-bouncing,
sexually-harrassing corrupt Congressmen were voted out in the last
election? It just goes to show that incumbents, no matter how bad or
how grievous their crimes, are almost always re-elected. Hell, there

have even been numerous cases of public officials getting re-elected
after they've died. Voter apathy.

--
Jerry Gardner (jerry@isi.com) | "Violence is the last refuge of
Integrated Systems, Inc. | the incompetent" - Isaac Asimov

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1993 19:56:16 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.bbn.com!petra!
popovich@ames.arpa
Subject: Give a VE $5.60, walk
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>So if "theory" doesn't have anything to do with operating competency, why
>require it? If the code test is hazing, then so is the theory test.

Because ham radio licensees are allowed to build and repair their own
equipment, and the theory is important for that privilege. Of course,
what they test is pretty minimal, and it's easy to argue that perhaps
a tougher theory test should be required in order to homebrew
equipment. Perhaps the Canadians have this right, with their Basic
(examined on operating aspects, allows use of commercial rigs with
250W or less power only) and Advanced (examined on technical aspects,
allows higher power and/or homebrewing of equipment) class licenses.

>Why should knowledge of satellites and digital modes be a requirement for
>a license? Not everyone uses or wants to use these modes, so why make it
>a requirement? You like it, you use it, but to require it is no different
>than requiring knowledge of code.

You have a point there, but the idea is again that since the license
grants you these privileges, you can be examined on these modes.
Perhaps if satellites and digital modes were separate endorsements of
some sort, it wouldn't be necessary to include questions on these
topics on the ordinary amateur license exam. The problem with
endorsements, of course, is that the FCC can't administer the six
classes of ham radio licenses that we have now. Endorsements would
really be quite unenforceable.
      -Steve

Date: 20 Jul 93 17:45:51 EDT

From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Order pizza on your autopatch now
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, bote@access.digex.net (John Boteler) writes:
>andy@clark.net (Andrew M. Cohn) writes:
>>Knowing that it is OK to order PIZZA via autopatch, the NEXT debate will
>>be whether it's also OK to order a burger and fries instead. ; > K4ADL
>
>
>Is it legal to autopatch your physician to ask if
>a burger and fries are OK to eat?
>
>High cholesterol and all that...
>
>--
>
>bote@access.digex.net (John Boteler)
>WARNING: You are subject to pre-emption!
>

Wouldn't this be considered Health & Welfare traffic? :-}

Date: 20 Jul 93 19:16:56 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Order pizza on your autopatch now
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

You know, the most annoying thing about all this is that I'm gonna have to
reword the section on rec.radio.amateur.policy in the Guide to the Personal
Radio Newsgroups, now that two items in the list of subjects the group covers
have been obsoleted...
--
Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
                     "iHaTeX." -- Andrew Burt

Date: 20 Jul 1993 20:20:52 GMT
From: nothing.ucsd.edu!brian@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Order pizza on your autopatch now
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1765@arrl.org> jkearman.org (Jim Kearman) writes:
>Who will be the first ham to order a pizza via autopatch? It's

>something I've hungered to do for many years.

Ordering pizza via phone machine (now called 'autopatches') was
something we used to do all the time back in the early 70s, before
the pharisees among us decided we'd all be better off if every single
goddamn law and regulation were enforced to the letter and beyond.

Of course, that was before the ARRL and other old farts had discovered
two-meter FM. I don't think we'll ever recover from that!
      - Brian

Date: 16 Jul 93 12:14:00 GMT
From: overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!uchinews!cs.umd.edu!nocusuhs!Pt!skates.gsfc.nasa.gov!
nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov!@dog.ee.lbl.gov
Subject: The Canonical list of Code-Wars Answers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CA5w1F.4zA@newsserver.pixel.kodak.com>, wpd@raster.kodak.com (Bill
DeMatties) writes...
>William J Turner (wjturner@iastate.edu) wrote:
>: In article <930713.020025.7W9.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>
system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:
>: >brian@amdcl2.amd.com (Brian McMinn N5PSS) writes:
>: >> 30) Hams who started with No-Code now represent 98% of all hams!
>: >
>: >Could be, but lots of them upgraded because we didn't like our N#XXX
>: >calls. :)
>
>: What about us who upgraded and kept our N#XXX calls?
>
>
>   You couldn't pay me to change my call sign!
>
>
>--
>   Bill DeMatties | Electricity is actually made up of extremely tiny
>   N2USA | particles, called electrons, that you cannot see
>wpd@raster.kodak.com | with the naked eye unless you have been drinking.

Bill:

I can see WHY you don't want to change your call. I wouldn't either. Yours
doesn't sound bad in code either.

Erich
N3OXM

In article <16JUL199308294872@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov> stocker@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov
(ERICH FRANZ STOCKER) writes:
!>In article <221r3aINN55t@bashful.isi.com>, jerry@isi.com (Jerry Gardner x323)
writes...
!>>
!>>I'm in favor of outlawing both the code and theory tests.
!>
!>Every time the discussion moves toward dealing with the relationship of
!>code to operations and electronics competency, this lunatic fringe starts
!>the response with lets just kill all evaluation. Questioning the code as
!>a measure of competency or its relationship to operating procedures is
!>not an attempt to end all testing.

So those who disagree with the code test are "progressive" but anyone
who disagrees with both the code and theory tests is a "lunatic"?

!>What needs to happen is that the code speed requirements should be
!>revisited as to their applicability to license differentations and the
!>written tests need to be revisited to ensure that they contain the appropriate
!>level of material (right now I don't think that they do -- too little
!>theory too much memorization of bands and whether the mariannas are in
!>ITU region 3 or not {what knowledge does that really demonstrate})

But look at how the vast majority of new hams operate: they buy a commercial
rig, antenna, and coax from HRO, plug it into the wall, connect the cables
and start operating. The vast majority never use even the smallest shred
of "theory" they may have accidentally learned while "studying" for their
license.

Why should this "theory" be so important for licensing purposes when
it is almost never used? What does Ohm's Law have to do with buying a
handheld and yapping on two-meter repeaters? It has about the same

relevence as code does, I'm afraid. One does not need to know electronic
theory to be a competant operator. I doubt the average police dispatcher
knows even the vaguest hint of theory, but no one questions their
operating competency.

So if "theory" doesn't have anything to do with operating competency, why
require it? If the code test is hazing, then so is the theory test.

!>No one is trying to eliminate code as an operations mode. You like it you
!>use it. The question is whether speed in this area is the proper differentiator
!>between a Novice and Genera and Advanced and Extra. Or, should that
!>differentiation be theory and operating procedures including knowledge
!>of the newer digital modes and satellites.

Why should knowledge of satellites and digital modes be a requirement for
a license? Not everyone uses or wants to use these modes, so why make it
a requirement? You like it, you use it, but to require it is no different
than requiring knowledge of code.

--
Jerry Gardner (jerry@isi.com) | "Violence is the last refuge of
Integrated Systems, Inc. | the incompetent" - Isaac Asimov

Date: 20 Jul 1993 10:58:20 -0700
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!darwin.sura.net!mojo.eng.umd.edu!news.isi.com!news.isi.com!
not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <221r3aINN55t@bashful.isi.com>,
<16JUL199308294872@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>, <22h0qdINNlpo@network.ucsd.edu>win.sur
Subject : Re: Give a VE $5.60, walk

In article <22h0qdINNlpo@network.ucsd.edu> brian@nothing.ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor)
writes:

!Yes, the days when one's ability to "pound brass" was sufficient to
!guarantee entry into the elite world of amateur radio are drawing to a
!close. As the technical requirements of ham radio become greater and
!greater, the code operators will find themselves ranked with the
!has-been athletes of other forgotten sports. And about time, I say.

Give me a break! As the technical requirements become greater and greater,
the "average" ham will just have more rote memorization to perform before

taking the test.

--
Jerry Gardner (jerry@isi.com) | "Violence is the last refuge of
Integrated Systems, Inc. | the incompetent" - Isaac Asimov

Date: 16 Jul 93 12:06:00 GMT
From: overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!uchinews!cs.umd.edu!nocusuhs!Pt!skates.gsfc.nasa.gov!
nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov!@dog.ee.lbl.gov
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul11.054430.6530@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,
<CA29oH.Ks@squam.banyan.com>, <930713.015754.5P2.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>
Subject : Re: Give a VE $5.60, walk

In article <930713.015754.5P2.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>, system@garlic.sbs.com
(Tony Pelliccio) writes...
>dts@banyan.com (Daniel Senie) writes:
>
>> The short answer is that the code tests are a government approved form of Haz
>> ing.
>> This from a government that outlawed hazing...
>
>Ok, just one more time. This is your brain, and this is your brain on
>drugs. Seriously, it isn't the government that sets the rule about morse
>code proficiency, it's an ITU requirement. The problem is that the ITU
>didn't bother to specify a speed and now it's causing all sorts of
>problems with the whiners who think that morse code is cruel and unusual
>punishment. Awwwwwww... poor baby.
>
>Tony

Once again Tony you are wrong. The ITU only requires a knowledge of the
code for HF. They don't specify the speed or the fact that one has to
be able to send 20wpm to show that one is a knowledgeable radio operator.
The whole argument about code speed is unbelievably stupid. Speed shows
nothing about electronics knowledge, operating procedures, or advancing
the state of the art, not to speak of emergency commo.

It seems incredible to me that the very people who advocate morse as the
ultimate evaluation for ham radio would be the ones who object to sending
slower so that they can help other hams to increase speed. This attitude
is more indicative of initiation rites than of love of the mode. It
enables the "selected few" , the "SS" of ham radio to thumb they noses

at the idiots who can only send 5 wpm or 13 wpm or none. All the while
saying that the scum should be removed from amateur radio.

If you are a morse code advocate, you should go out of your way to help
others achieve the proficiency that you find so exciting. The idea is not
to shut people out but to bring them in. We have enough segmentation in
society. The morse fanatics are akin to the groups in society that
discriminate against others on some one issue (e.g. race, relation,
country of origin, etc).

For those who like morse and don't want to help others -- fine! But,
why does that mean you have to attack those that don't have the same
approach you do. Live and let live. The hobby is big enough for the
diversity it has and is continuing to get.

For those anti-Tech bigots, should note that ARRL statistics show that
a larger percentage of no code Techs upgrade than Novices and Novices had
code to begin with. The system is working.

Erich
N3OXM
```
>_____
>        o      o  Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
>         \    /   system @ garlic.sbs.com
>          \__/
>  _____(oo)    Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
> /|  ___  \/
> / | {MTV}||      MoooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
>* ||{___}||
> ||-----||   (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
>  ^^    ^^  _____
>
```

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1993 19:19:18 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!gatech!ukma!
rsg1.er.usgs.gov!dgg.cr.usgs.gov!bodoh@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <743039810snx@llondel.demon.co.uk>, <22dsa9$214@sun1.clark.net>,
<743129271snx@llondel.demon.co.uk>
Subject : Re: Order pizza on your autopatch now

In article <743129271snx@llondel.demon.co.uk>, dave@llondel.demon.co.uk (David
Hough) writes:
|> In article <22dsa9$214@sun1.clark.net> andy@clark.net (Andrew M. Cohn) writes:
|> > David Hough (dave@llondel.demon.co.uk) wrote:

```
|> > : In article <22ar7e$km9@access.digex.net> bote@access.digex.net (John
Boteler) writes:
|> > : > *ordering food*. This is not a drill, it actually
|> > : > says ordering food is no longer restricted.
|> > : >
|> > : > So be the first on your repeater to order a pizza over
|> > : > the autopatch, preferably for the next ham club meeting! :)
|> > : >
|> > : Does this mean that people can't endlessly debate whether it is legal
|> > : anymore? What will they all moan about now? I daresay someone will try and
|> > : abolish CW next :-)
|> >
|> > Knowing that it is OK to order PIZZA via autopatch, the NEXT debate will
|> > be whether it's also OK to order a burger and fries instead.  ; >  K4ADL
|> >
|> OK.... try this one:
|>
|> If ordering food, does it have to be for the consumption of the licensee?
|> Can you order food on behalf of (a) another ham and (b) an unlicenced person?
|>
|> Dave
|>


--
Third-party pizza!!!!!

++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer, Hughes STX, N0X?? (in the mail)  +
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA  57198     (605) 594-6830       +
+ Internet; bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)
          +
+    "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P
          +
++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

-----------------------------

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1993 13:28:20 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
darwin.sura.net!news-feed-2.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!
bongo!julian@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <22ar7e$km9@access.digex.net>, <743039810snx@llondel.demon.co.uk>,
<22dsa9$214@sun1.clark.net>t
Subject : Re: Order pizza on your autopatch now

In article <22dsa9$214@sun1.clark.net> andy@clark.net (Andrew M. Cohn) writes:
```

>David Hough (dave@llondel.demon.co.uk) wrote:
>: In article <22ar7e$km9@access.digex.net> bote@access.digex.net (John Boteler)
writes:
>: > *ordering food*. This is not a drill, it actually
>: > says ordering food is no longer restricted.
>: >
>: > So be the first on your repeater to order a pizza over
>: > the autopatch, preferably for the next ham club meeting! :)
>: >
>Knowing that it is OK to order PIZZA via autopatch, the NEXT debate will
>be whether it's also OK to order a burger and fries instead. ; > K4ADL

     Have the FCC imposed a limit on the number of toppings? Also
if I use a U.S. callsign, is Canadian bacon OK? We do have reciprocity
don't we?

--
Julian Macassey, N6ARE julian@bongo.tele.com Voice: (213) 653-4495
Paper Mail: 742 1/2 North Hayworth Avenue, Hollywood, California 90046-7142

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1993 20:19:59 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CA29oH.Ks@squam.banyan.com>,
<930713.015754.5P2.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>,
<16JUL199308062528@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>
Subject : Re: Give a VE $5.60, walk

In article <16JUL199308062528@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov> stocker@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov
(ERICH FRANZ STOCKER) writes:
>society. The morse fanatics are akin to the groups in society that
>discriminate against others on some one issue (e.g. race, relation,
>country of origin, etc).
>
>Erich
>N3OXM
>>

Erich,
   We cannot change our race or country of origin; but our skill in copying
code is something which we DO have control over. Thus, your statement
comparing morse enthusiasts to bigots is ridiculous.
   Actually, the true morse enthusiasts are probably too busy having fun

down on the low bands to even be participating in any of these news group
discussions!

Jeff, NH6IL (IL = ..   .-.. --- ...- .   --.- .-. .--.)

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1993 20:59:03 GMT
From: haven.umd.edu!darwin.sura.net!howland.reston.ans.net!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!
newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!help.cc.iastate.edu!willmore@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <221r3aINN55t@bashful.isi.com>,
<16JUL199308294872@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>, <22hbg9INN6ju@bashful.isi.com>hel
Subject : Re: Give a VE $5.60, walk

jerry@isi.com (Jerry Gardner x323) writes:
>But look at how the vast majority of new hams operate: they buy a commercial
>rig, antenna, and coax from HRO, plug it into the wall, connect the cables
>and start operating. The vast majority never use even the smallest shred
>of "theory" they may have accidentally learned while "studying" for their
>license.

There isn't much theory in the Tech test. Most of it comes in the General
or Advanced tests. (Probably much more comes in the Extra, but I haven't
studied for that far up.)

>Why should this "theory" be so important for licensing purposes when
>it is almost never used? What does Ohm's Law have to do with buying a
>handheld and yapping on two-meter repeaters? It has about the same
>relevence as code does, I'm afraid. One does not need to know electronic
>theory to be a competant operator. I doubt the average police dispatcher
>knows even the vaguest hint of theory, but no one questions their
>operating competency.

To 'yap' on a 2m repeater, you only need a no-code tech license which
has just a tiny amount of theory to its test. If all you want to do is
'yap', why do you need more than a nc Tech?

I guess there's an assumed correlation between electronic knowlege and
operating competency. Wether that's true, I don't know.

>So if "theory" doesn't have anything to do with operating competency, why
>require it? If the code test is hazing, then so is the theory test.

Ask yourself "Why do I want a license higher than Tech if all I want to do
I am allowed to do with that license?" Licenses beyone Tech don't get you
much.

>Why should knowledge of satellites and digital modes be a requirement for
>a license? Not everyone uses or wants to use these modes, so why make it
>a requirement? You like it, you use it, but to require it is no different
>than requiring knowledge of code.

I don't expect to ever do much HF or satellite work, but that doesn't mean
that knowlege of the issues associated with them aren't meaningful. Do you
want there to be different licenses for people with different interests?
Senerio: "I'll never do HF, so all I want is my 50+ license, but I don't
want to do satellite work, so I won't bother getting the sattelite license."

Now we have a few dozen amateur license classes, etc. Is that a good
solution?

Later,
David
--

----
willmore@iastate.edu | "Death before dishonor" | "Better dead than greek" |
David Willmore | "Ever noticed how much they look like orchids? Lovely!" |

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1993 21:13:26 GMT
From: haven.umd.edu!darwin.sura.net!howland.reston.ans.net!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!
newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!help.cc.iastate.edu!willmore@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul16.134947.1@levy.fnal.gov>,
<willmore.742886953@tremplo.gis.iastate.edu>,
<1993Jul17.205506.1@levy.fnal.gov>edu
Subject : Re: Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer

levy@levy.fnal.gov (Mark E. Levy, ext. 8056) writes:
>> What? One user PC? Have you never heard of Unix? Just because it runs on
>> a pc, that doesn't make it a DOS application.

>Yes, a *one* user PC. That's what the original poster suggested.

The phrase that I remember was "a pc or a workstation". Neither is
single user. The only pc's that are single user are the Mac family
and I wouldn't suggest that anyone use one of those for a large

database.

>And I've heard of Unix. I just don't think much of it.

I noticed that from your .sig. Would you prefer MVS/JES/JCL as a better
solution?

>> poster also said that a good workstation could be used. I'd put an Alpha AXP
>> 3000/300 up against that burroughs for this job any day.

>I'm very encouraged by the Alpha. But, I wouldn't say that the workstation
>versions released so far could hold a candle to the Burroughs data-moving
>capability. CPU-wise they probably blow the Burroughs away. Megabytes-per-
>second; I don't think so. Now, the data-center Alphas are a different story.
>I doubt that the callsign database is very CPU-intensive.

You are correct in your impression of the Alpha's. An Alpha AXP 10000/610
has set the world record for the database sort benchmark. It beat a cray
by a factor of three and the closest multiprocessor supercomputer by a
factor of 6 or so. Yeah, I would suppose that one of those could beat an
old Burroughs.
--
----
willmore@iastate.edu | "Death before dishonor" | "Better dead than greek" |
David Willmore | "Ever noticed how much they look like orchids? Lovely!" |

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #242
****